

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARTHA STEELE	:
	:
	: CIVIL ACTION
v.	:
	:
	: NO. 02-4347
HCI DIRECT	:

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2005, upon consideration of Counsel's Motion to Withdraw as Attorney for Plaintiff (docket no. 37) and pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1(c), it is **ORDERED** that the motion is **GRANTED**.<sup>1</sup> It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff may now proceed in this matter pro se.

**BY THE COURT:**

**S/Bruce W. Kauffman**  
**BRUCE W. KAUFFMAN, J.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Ordinarily, courts will not grant motions to withdraw unless arrangements for new counsel have been made. In this case, however, Plaintiff has shown a willingness to proceed pro se. See Rose The Morning Call, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3912 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 28, 1997) ("it is clear that plaintiff no longer wishes to be represented by [counsel of record, and] prefers to proceed pro se in this matter." Moreover, it is clear that the lawyer-counsel relationship has irretrievably broken down. See Wolgin v. Smith, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12437 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 21, 1996).